

REMARKS


Claims 1, 5 and 6-9 are pending herein. Claim 1 has been amended to place it in better form, by removing "optional" paragraph (4) and placing it in new dependent claim 6. Claims 2-4 have been represented as claims 6-9 to utilize proper multiple dependencies.

It is believed that the Office Action contains an error in the grouping of claims. The Office Action states that Group I includes claims 1-3 drawn to a method and Group II includes claim 4 drawn to an apparatus. In fact, however, claim 4 is drawn to a method and claim 5 is drawn to an apparatus. Applicants respectfully submit that the grouping of claims should have been Group I: claims 1-4 and Group II: claim 5 and that the appropriate grouping of claims as amended now is Group I: claims 1 and 6-9 and Group II: claim 5. The claim groupings have been so treated.

Further, the avowed purpose of the Patent and Trademark Office in requiring restriction is the avoidance of a burdensome examination and multiple searches. However, MPEP §803 provides that if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden the Examiner must do so even if it is considered to include claims to two different or independent inventions.

It is respectfully submitted that the examination of all of the claims of this application will not place an undue burden on the PTO. In fact, it is submitted that claim 5 should be examined along with the claims of Group I because as a claim which depends from claim 1 it includes all of the features thereof. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the restriction requirement and that she concurrently examine the claims of both groups together in this application.

Dated: October 28, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

Paul A. Serbinowski
Reg. No. 34,429